



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

stroke that was mistaken for *i*) seems unlikely; such an abbreviation for *quam* would be an anomaly; *q* with an abbreviating stroke through the tail was probably the cause of the error. In the majority of cases where our editor is in doubt whether a correction in the Thuanus is to be attributed to T<sup>2</sup>, or to T<sup>1</sup> or T<sup>3</sup>, I agree with Dianu in attributing it to T<sup>2</sup>; in some cases the reference mark makes the attribution almost certain. The compendium in IX, 44, 2, if correctly printed, stands for *est*, not *et*.

There is no index and the reader will still find use for his Teubner text.

CHARLES H. BEESON

---

*P. Vergili Maronis opera post Ribbeckium tertium recognovit Gualtherus Ianell.* Editio Maior. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MCMXX. Pp. xxviii+428.

Ribbeck's great critical edition of Virgil has undergone a gradual process of contraction. His first edition required three good-sized volumes for the text, the second (1894, 1895) was reduced by more than a third, and the present volume contains only about half as many pages as the second edition; the format has been reduced to that of the ordinary Teubner text. The *Appendix Vergiliana* has been omitted, the testimonia have disappeared, and the apparatus has shrunk, in some places almost to the vanishing point of usefulness.

In the first ten pages of the Preface the editor states the principles he has followed in constituting the text and apparatus. His announced purpose is to free the text from Ribbeck's often reckless changes and restore the tradition. He has made no new examination of the MSS previously used; the readings of M, which he regards as the "best" MS, are taken from Hoffman's collation; those of F, which he classes as second in value, are derived from the Vatican reproduction. He cites occasionally readings from a Codex Rehdigeranus, a MS of the twelfth century, which he collated at Norden's suggestion. He has examined the external evidence also, including the centones, which Ribbeck disregarded.

In matters of orthography the editor has not attempted to reproduce the variations of spelling of the MSS; hence *-om* after *u* and *v* everywhere; following Gellius he spells *ahenus* everywhere. A few innovations occur, e.g., *Aepytus* for *Epytus*, *Elymus* for *Helymus*, *Herulum* for *Erulum*, *Hortinae* for *Ortinae*, *Mevius* for *Maevius*, *Mezzentius* for *Mezentius* and *Pthia* for *Phthia*; the spelling with *g* instead of *c* has been adopted in such forms as *Agmon*, *Agragas*, *Cygnus*, *Gnosus*, *Ognus*, *Progne*, *Pyragmon*. In punctuation the Codex Mediceus has been followed as far as practicable.

The Preface also contains the text of the Vita Donatiana, based on eight MSS, the Serviana, based on eight MSS, and the Vita Probi, based on four MSS. Three pages are devoted to the testimonia.

In printing the text the editor has indicated at the top of the page the capital-letter MSS involved; there are a number of discrepancies with Ribbeck's statements, but in each case only one or two lines are in question; e.g., G does not contain *Aen.* iii. 208, 209, 227 (except traces of one word), 228, 531, 532; similarly, *Aen.* xi. 691, 692 are not found in P; on p. 250 the MSS for *Aen.* vii. 482-485 are MRV not MPV.

The critical apparatus contains only those variants which in the opinion of the editor are "graviore momento vel memorabiles"; the *deteriores* are cited only when they agree with one or more of the best MSS. It is of more importance to have the evidence of the *deteriores* where they support a reading admitted to the text against the consensus of the majuscule MSS; the same principle holds for the external evidence. This material could have been included without greatly increasing the bulk of the apparatus, since the conservatism of the editor has reduced considerably the number of such cases; e.g., E. III, 38, no evidence is given for *facili*, the accepted reading; Servius is quoted for *facilis*, "Donatus sic legit," but the rest of the citation which, with the MSS  $\gamma \pi$ , is the only support for *facili*, is omitted, "legitur tamen et 'torno facili'"; E. IV, 26 and 33, the readings of R, the only majuscule MS for this part of the poem, are given, but not the evidence for the readings admitted into the text; there is no critical note on *flavescet*, v. 26, and one might infer that *flavescet* is the form vouched for by the MSS; in point of fact R  $\gamma^1 b^1$  have *flavescit*; E. IV, 62 is one of the few cases where the editor admits an emendation, that of Birt; the version of Quintilian, *qui non risere parenti*, approved by Crusius and adopted by Hirzel, might well have been included in the apparatus; G. I, 383, the evidence for *et quae*,  $\gamma bc$  and Servius, is not given; G. I, 461, the text has *vehat*; the readings of M<sup>1</sup> R (*ferat*) and M<sup>2</sup> (*verat*) are given, but the *deteriores*, which have *vehat* or *veat*, are not mentioned; G. IV, 148 has no critical note and one might infer that MP have *me*, whereas these MSS as well as  $\gamma a$  omit it; the only evidence for *me* is found in  $\chi b$ ; v. 241 has *suffire*; the apparatus reads *suffere*, M(P)R omitting the evidence for *suffire* ( $\gamma bc$  and Priscian); *Aen.* II. 398 has no critical note; the text has *demittimus* but the MSS (except the second hand in some of the *deteriores*) have *dimittimus*; the editor has done better at v. 734 where he gives the evidence for *dispiciunt* and *despiciunt*, *Aen.* vi. 20,  $bc \pi$  should be mentioned as well as  $r$ ; *Aen.* vi. 617 has no critical note though practically all the MSS have *destricti*, not *districti*; *Aen.* vii. 740 has *Abellae*, with no critical note; the MSS have *bellae*, except a Vienna MS quoted by Ribbeck in his *Prolegomena*, page 353; the reading *Abellae* was known to Servius, who, however, prefers *bellae*; *Aen.* ix. 455, the evidence for *tepidā*, the accepted reading, is omitted; similarly the manuscript evidence ( $\gamma bc$ ) for *levabat* in *Aen.* x. 834.

The apparatus would have been more useful if the editor had included the evidence on the more important passages where he has reverted to the MSS, rejecting readings long established in our text; e.g., there are no

critical notes on the following passages: E. III, 101 *exitium est pecori*] *exitium pecori* c χ, Ribbeck and Hirtzel; G. I, 418, *vias*] *vices* Ribbeck and Hirtzel with two *deteriores*; Aen. ii. 584 *habet haec*] most editors read *nec habet*; Aen. iv. 217 *subnixus*] *subnexus*, Ribbeck and Hirtzel with two *deteriores*; Aen. v. 522 *subito*] *subitum*, Ribbeck and Hirtzel with several *deteriores*; Aen. vi. 96 *quam*] *qua*, one MS, Seneca, Bentley, Ribbeck and Hirtzel; Aen. vi. 609 *et*] *aut* c, Nonius, Servius, Ribbeck, Hirtzel; Aen. ix. 412 *adversi*] *aversi*, one MS, Hirtzel, *ab versi*, Ribbeck; Aen. ix. 456 *spumantis*] *spumanti* γ b, Ribbeck, Hirtzel; Aen. x. 805 *arte*] *arce*, two *deteriores*, Ribbeck, Hirtzel. In the following passages the reading of Ribbeck and Hirtzel might have been included in the critical note: G. IV, 412 *tam tu* for *tanto*; Aen. ii. 503 *ampla* for *tanta*; Aen. ii. 587 *flammae* for *famae*; Aen. v. 573 *Trinacrii* or *Trinacriis* for *Trinacriae*; Aen. viii. 108 *tacitis* for *tacitos*; Aen. ix. 539 *albis* for *armis*; Aen. x. 673 *quosne* for *quosque*; Aen. x. 705 *Paris* for *creat*.

The apparatus should be corrected in the following places: Aen. i. 193, where F as well as MR has *humo*; Aen. ix. 143, where Ianell gives *parvo* as the reading of FM, but according to Ribbeck the last letter in F is on an erasure; Aen. ix. 287, where there is no critical note; the reader would infer that *periculi est* is the attested reading, but *est* is omitted in PR and is by the second hand in Mb; Aen. xii. 221, where PR as well as M have *pubentes*, which Ianell accepts; Ribbeck and Hirtzel prefers *tabentes*; there is also a discrepancy between Ribbeck and Ianell as to the reading of M<sup>2</sup> at Aen. ii. 778; Ribbeck has *portare*, Ianell *asportare*.

The proofreading has been carefully done, but the following errors have escaped notice: page vi read A 11 487 for A 11 787; page 387 read 15 for 25 in the citation from Isidore; page 427 read VII for XII under *Umbro*.

CHARLES H. BEESON

*Das Erbe der Alten.* Neue Folge. Heft II: *Altgriechischer Baumkultus.* Untersuchungen von LUDWIG WENIGER. Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung in Leipzig, 1920. Pp. vi+64. M. 3.50.

In this very gracefully written brochure the author, well known for numerous substantial monographs on religious history, discusses the significance of the symbolism back of the employment among the Greeks for a variety of usages of leaves and branches, mainly in the form of garlands, from special trees or varieties of trees. He finds the principal *causa efficiens* in an association of certain forms of plant life with the worship of the earth-mother, and here especially in a mantic relation. The interest is largely cultural and psychological, although, of course, the religious history of some of the great shrines and many related questions are taken up. The leading idea is thus expressed: "With the worthless leaves which the ancients wove